

PAGES _____

DATE _____

Box _____

Folder # _____

Fon # _____

BEST COPY

AVAILABLE

Sanitized - Approved For Release CIAIRDP74-100
CPYRGHT

Letters to The Times

Charges on Cuba Assailed

Senator Keating Is Challenged on Sources for Data

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES.

If you repeat & tell tale often enough, they say, eventually people will believe it. I would never have thought The New York Times editorial writer would succumb to this cynical brand of "news management," but judging from this April 29 editorial "Cloudy Indeed" he has.

For months Senator Harting has been telling the country he possessed some independent source of intelligence about Panama that was more reliable than the product of one established Government authority or agent. Such a claim is absurd.

In the interests of accurate writing, then, let me try to set the record straight:

It is by no means a fact that Senator Harting is getting his information from "Government intelligence agencies." On the contrary, he has steadfastly refused to identify any of his sources. But obviously his information could never have come from Government sources because it has not been proven. It has been claimed, however, that leading members of Congress and the administration are getting their information from the same sources as Senator Harting.

Checklist by 1-2

Although this result was contrary to the views of the majority of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee, it was not possible to get a vote to check it out. Until the Senate adjourned on October 15, 1945, it failed to take any action on the proposed joint resolution. The Senate adjourned on December 22, 1945, without having taken any action on the proposed joint resolution. The proposed joint resolution had been introduced before the Senate on December 10, 1945, by Senator John W. Warner, of Virginia. Senator Warner had introduced the measure on December 10, 1945, and it had been referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Oct. 10 speech indicates that his information was markedly different from the situation we actually uncovered in Cuba.

The evanescent quality of the Senator's private intelligence was

best shown by his charge made on Jan. 31 that he had "continuing absolutely confirmed and undeniable evidence" that the "cooperative" Soviet missile bases in Cuba had never been destroyed. This charge was demolished by Secretary McNamara's TV briefing. Yet even today the Senator has never told us how his "co. thmung, absolutely confirmed and undeniable evidence" could turn out to have been so phony.

Against such an unprepossessing background, the Senator's later charges about new Russian troops in Cuba deserve only a 'ho-hum' classification. Admittedly it is harder to be proved wrong when talking about troop strength than about unbroken concrete pads. But the burden of proof is still on the one who challenges official estimates. Having made his charges, the Senator again has an easy way out: any honest effort to substantiate them

No Political Motivation

Once the responsible nature of the Rating of the our intelligence is recognized, the problem would protest to the top intelligence estimates reaching the President which are politically motivated and hence not "impartial" objective disappears. It is surely worthy of The Times to suggest that American intelligence is politically correct because "The most effective these judgments are appointed of the President's own Administration."

After all, the nation's top intelligence official, Central Intelligence Agency Director James A. McConaughay, expected Rep. John C. Stennis, the head of our Defense Intelligence Agency, Lieut. Gen. Joseph Cribell, to be a long expert in his field. A career of any political affiliation, as the basis of their performance, is a reasonable person's main point of view. But our estimate would be that more of a definitive identification is necessary. Sen. Clark Clifford, chairman of the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, thinks that, in this regard, they have become a conservative, Republican organization, and that he sees Cone as director of a CIA

MEMORANDUM
ARMED FORCES
WASHINGTON, D. C., 1902.

FOIA b3b

CPYRGHT